



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

our whole body; and Protestantism remains as much in the dark as to our defects as it is to our virtues."—p. 427.

"Once more, if the strong arm of 'order' and surveillance silences the outbreaks of foreign anti-Catholicism, it does not prevent divisions and quarrels among Catholics themselves, sometimes of a very disastrous tendency, but which are without any parallel amongst ourselves. We have our little difficulties, it is true; our heart-burnings, our newspaper and conversational squabbles; our disagreements about Gothicism, plain-chant, politics, and other such topics; but these are nothing to the deep seated wounds produced by such contests as occasionally shake the foundations of clerical and lay Catholic society abroad. What have we ever had here at all like the affair of Gioberti and the Jesuits in Italy; or like the discussions of which the soil of France is so rife, where even the warfare of two periodicals is of so serious a nature that the highest dignitaries of the Church become involved in it? And are we wrong in attributing this tendency of our English Catholic disputes to die away peaceably to the circumstance that we live in a land where discussion is the order of the day; where everybody says what he likes, and there is such a surfeit of plain speaking, that a really furious contest cannot be got up among Catholics, for the simple reason that people will not have their ears stunned by the disputants, who, accordingly, subside into silence for the want of backing? Whereas, if we were held in by a restrictive system, whether political or theological, which forbade us to read, write, or say just what we chose, the result would be, that whenever we *could* quarrel we would do it with a vengeance, and make up for our want of liberty in things in general by an outrageous licence in things in particular."—p. 430-1.

Cordially agreeing in nearly all the above well expressed remarks, we still venture to ask whether the Roman Catholic authorities are not doing their best at the present moment to introduce a restrictive theological system, which *does forbid men to read, write, or say what they please*, and doing all in their power to prevent free "discussion" being any longer "the order of the day" in those momentous matters which concern the well-being of mankind more deeply than any other, both in this world and in the next?

The writer in the *Rambler* concludes his able article with an exhortation to his Roman Catholic readers, "from the peer down to the mechanic, to show themselves among their fellow countrymen."

"We submit to the younger members of our old families, to the cultivated and sincere members of the learned professions, and to every man who has brains, energy, and a tolerable education, that this is not the time for us to slink into corners" (as the Roman Catholic priests do in matters of controversy in Ireland) "like naughty boys, or to lie down on the ground, and let bigoted ride rough-shod over our heads" (of course, meaning as it has done in the case of the Jesuits at Windsor). "We must make ourselves felt and recognized as an existing part of the nation; and this can only be done by sharing in its life, fulfilling our portion of its duties, and contributing to its instruction and enjoyment." (What would the *Rambler* say to beginning by taking up the often repeated challenge of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and contribute to the instruction of the rest of the nation, of which it desires to be felt and recognized as an existing part, by disproving some leading parts, at least, of what we have been attempting to prove in our pages?) "The result will be not only a diminution of the difficulties which beset those who are disposed to become Catholics, and an enlightening of the minds of thousands as to our real creed" (objects, doubtless, of legitimate and intense interest to the conductors of the *Rambler*), "but it will be a better protection to our clergy, to our nuns, and to our poor, than all the assaults we can make upon the doctrines of Protestantism, and all the satires with which we can show up the inconsistencies of its adherents"—p. 433-4.

We cordially agree here with the able writer, and sincerely trust that he will begin the new year by earnestly setting about the task of "enlightening the minds of Protestants as to his real creed, and removing out of the way the difficulties which beset those who are disposed to become (Roman) Catholics," as we ourselves may possibly become, if he or his colleagues will only take the trouble of "showing themselves" to their fellow-countrymen, and not any longer "slink into corners like naughty boys," or lie down on the ground and let the conductors of such a (bigoted?) periodical as the CATHOLIC LAYMAN "ride rough-shod over their heads," for want of opposition, to the great mortification

of that part of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland which still takes the liberty of "reading, writing, and saying just what they choose," in spite of *would-be* ecclesiastical rulers, and their "Continental" restrictions.

We have received letters from two different correspondents, both written under the misapprehension that we *advocated* prayers for the dead in our last number.

Now, we did no such thing. We were answering a Roman Catholic correspondent, who alleged, in proof that St. Augustine believed in Purgatory, the fact that he prayed for his mother, Monica, after her death. We fully admitted that he did so pray; and we admitted, also, that similar prayers had been used in the Church from a very early period of her history—so early, indeed, as the second century.

In reply to any one who finds fault with us for making such admissions, we think it quite defence enough to say that the things we stated are true. We should consider ourselves quite unworthy of the confidence our readers repose in us if, when professing to discuss the opinions of the Fathers, we were to bring forward a carefully-selected list of the passages that tell in our favour, keeping in the background those that seem to tell against us. Our aim has always been to report fairly what we read, whatever may seem to be the consequences, and we feel very little temptation to be dishonest in this matter, as we do not consider ourselves in any way bound to adopt every opinion that has ever been held by any of the Fathers. But, were our temptations ten times as great as they are, we hope that we should be able to resist them, and to act up to our principles, by candidly placing before our readers the full state of the facts, as far as they are known to ourselves.

We also stated, in our last number, that there is not the least reason to think that the early Fathers who speak of prayers for the dead believed in Purgatory. We consider that we gave ample proofs for our assertion, viz.:—the fact that they never once speak of the departed saints as suffering pain after their removal from this world; that they give quite different reasons for their prayers; that they pray for the Blessed Virgin and the Apostles, whom they could never have supposed to be in Purgatory; and that the existence of Purgatory was a matter of doubtful speculation in the time of Augustine, notwithstanding the existence of prayers for the dead for two centuries before. All this proves beyond doubt that, whatever difficulty people now may have in conceiving prayers for the dead without a belief in Purgatory, still it is a matter of fact that such prayers were used for full two hundred years before the doctrine of Purgatory was established. The truth is, it was not the belief in Purgatory which gave rise to prayers for the dead, but it was the practice of prayers for the dead out of which the doctrine of Purgatory was developed. We think we can add that this is not our private opinion, but that of all candid and learned inquirers into the opinions of the Fathers, Roman Catholic or Protestant.

But our correspondents are mistaken if they suppose that, in stating honestly the results of our inquiries respecting the practice of the ancient Church, we meant to express any dissent from the course which the Church of England has adopted with regard to prayers for the dead. On the contrary, we believe she has used a very wise discretion in the course she has adopted.

In the first place, Roman Catholics must allow that the Church of the present day is at full liberty to depart from the practice of the Ancient Church, if she sees good reason to do so. The Church of Rome has abandoned many practices confessedly used by the Primitive Church: for instance, Love Feasts, the Kiss of Peace, the

Order of Deaconesses, and—most important of all—Communion in both kinds, which all Roman Catholic divines allow to have been the ordinary custom of the Ancient Church.

Now, since there is no Scripture precept for prayers for the dead, nor any example of such prayers in the Bible; since we have no information in what way such prayers are likely to benefit those in whose behalf they are offered; since these prayers have come to be mixed up with a false and superstitious belief; since most of such prayers *now* offered are founded on the belief in Purgatory; and since the use of such prayers would be likely to strengthen that belief: for all these reasons, we think the Church of England is amply justified in altering or omitting from her service book those prayers for the dead confessedly to be found in the ancient liturgies.

#### INTERCESSORY PRAYER.

##### A DIALOGUE.

[In order to enable the reader to understand the following dialogue, it is sufficient to explain that the speakers are Frank MacManus (who had been originally brought up as a Roman Catholic, and had become a Protestant under circumstances which may possibly be known to some of our readers) and his favourite sister Mary, who still continued warmly attached to her old religion. Frank's change of religion had produced for some time an estrangement between him and his family, and it was first in the house of a friend, who had purposely contrived the meeting, that he and his sister were, after the lapse of some time, rather unexpectedly brought together. We pass over that part of their conversation which referred only to their family concerns, and copy some of that portion in which their religious differences were discussed.]

Mary. I hope, dearest Frank, you feel that, notwithstanding the time that has passed since we have seen each other, and though I have obeyed my father's orders in not writing to you—I hope you feel sure that you have not been forgotten. I assure you, not a day has passed since that you have been out of my mind. I cannot tell you how I pitied you for all that you have suffered, and I know so well the causes that have brought a temporary blindness on your mind, that I feel certain that, after a time, you cannot fail to return to the old faith. I am sure, Frank, that my prayers will not be unanswered. Every day I have implored the Blessed Virgin to interest herself on your behalf; and our dear mother, who is now a saint in heaven, joins with me, I know, in my supplications, and I am sure our prayers will not be in vain.

Frank. I did feel sure, dearest Mary, that you had not forgotten me. And I can myself completely echo all you say. Not for a day have you and the other dear ones at Ballymanus been forgotten by me; and especially at the Throne of Grace, you have been on my mind, and I constantly implore our Blessed Lord for you all, and for you, Mary, in particular, that He will bring you to the knowledge of the truth which I enjoy. And I, too, trust that my prayers will be heard.

M. And yet both our prayers cannot be heard.

F. God has often ways of answering our prayers in a sense better for us than that in which we offer them. When you pray that I may be brought back to my old religion, all I am sure that you can wish for me is, that I may be brought to a knowledge of the truth, and that is also my prayer for you and for myself.

M. Yes; but I feel certain that our religion is the truth.

F. But suppose for a moment that it is possible you may be mistaken, would not then the best answer God could give to your prayers be, that instead of leading me back to error, He should bring both you and me to a fuller and clearer knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. There is one thing, however, in what you say which, though it ought not to have surprised me, I confess did shock me. It was your saying that it was the Virgin that you were imploring for me! It is now so long that I have been accustomed to use only one, the only Mediator, in approaching to God, and have felt it sinful to have recourse to any other, that it was painful to me to have it forced upon my thoughts again, that it was not so with you, and that you allowed any one to come between you and your God and Saviour.

M. Oh, Frank, this is a subject on which it would distress me to hear you talk. I think I could bear better to hear of any other of the errors you may have learned among Protestants than if they had taught you to blaspheme and dishonour the Holy Virgin.

F. God forbid that I should blaspheme or dishonour her, dear Mary. I have never been taught to think of her otherwise than as a holy woman, highly favoured of God, and honoured by Him in a way which could fall to the lot but of one woman upon earth. All I object to is, that she should be put by you into the place of God.

M. But, Frank, you must know very well that I do not put her into the place of God. If it was an ignorant Protestant who said it I should not be surprised; but that

you should say so, who have been brought up among us, and know all our feelings and opinions, does indeed astonish me. Surely, you know that we do not imagine she can give us anything of her own power. All that she does is to ask of her Son and obtain from Him the blessings of which we stand in need.

F. I know all this. I know that you do not consider her to be the Supreme God, and that you do not believe her to have any power except what He has given her; and yet do not be shocked with me for saying that I cannot regard this as sufficient to secure you from the sin of idolatry.

M. Idolatry! Frank. Really this is too much. I cannot believe that you seriously think I could be guilty of such a sin.

F. Will you bear with me a little, while I ask you a few questions. You must not wonder that I have a dread of the sin of idolatry; for I believe that there is no other against which the Bible contains more warnings. It declares God to be a jealous God, who does not choose that His glory should be given to another. And I cannot help having a dread of a sin that God has so repeatedly and expressly denounced.

M. I shall not differ with you as to the sin of idolatry; but I don't believe that you can ever prove me to be guilty of it.

F. But perhaps the heathen in the Apostles' time would have thought it just as impossible that they could be guilty of it. They worshipped many gods, no doubt; but, still, the educated among them believed in but one Supreme God, from whom they supposed the inferior divinities to receive all their power, and they never intended to offer to those inferior divinities any worship that they considered to be exclusively due to the Supreme God.

M. The educated may have believed as you say; but what of the uneducated?

F. Why, their worship, I dare say, differed from that of those better taught as much as the worship of the uneducated of your communion does from yours. I have been in Spain and Italy, and I should be sorry to think that you offered to the Blessed Virgin and to the saints honour of the same kind as I have seen paid them there.

M. But the most ignorant Catholic knows the Blessed Virgin not to be God; while among the heathen, educated and uneducated worshipped these inferior divinities as gods.

F. But surely you don't think that it is the name by which he is called that makes a being your god. The word gods is often used in a lower sense in the Bible, and is applied to the angels and even to human judges. It is not the being called by the name that makes a being your god. But what I understand by a god is, that invisible Being who you believe is able and willing to grant your requests, and to whom in times of distress or danger your heart most naturally turns with prayers for help. Now tell me, is there anything that you suppose the Blessed Virgin is not able to obtain for you?

M. I will not deny that I believe her intercession to be all-powerful, nor can I conceive it possible that her Son could refuse her anything.

F. And do you believe that she is willing to hear all your requests?

M. Surely I believe that she, the Mother of Mercy, is ready to hear the requests of one of her poor children.

F. More ready than God himself?

M. Well, that is a hard thing to say; yet I own I can never think of Him who is to be our Judge without a certain feeling of dread, and that I turn to her who is all mercy with a far greater feeling of confidence, that she is willing, in spite of my sinfulness, to do all I ask.

F. You have answered me candidly, dear Mary, and you have said nothing that has not been said before in far stronger language by devotional writers in your Church. But now I feel justified in having said that you allow some one else to come between you and your God and Saviour; and I own I cannot but regard this as idolatry. Believe me, that Being—prayers to whom rise most naturally to your lips—whom you consider as of unbounded compassion, and ready to lend a gracious ear to all your petitions, and as having power sufficient to obtain for you the fulfilment of your requests, that Being—call her by what name you will—that Being is your God.

M. I am shocked, Frank, that this matter should appear to you in such a light.

[After a silence]

But I think I can show you that you must be mistaken in the view you take of it. You said that you prayed for me; so I suppose that you would not think it wrong in me to offer prayers directly to God in your behalf?

F. No, surely.

M. Then you do not think it a sin in one Christian to offer prayers in behalf of another.

F. A sin! Why, I should think he must be a poor kind of Christian who prays for nobody but himself. It is bad enough to be selfish at other times; but that man must be deeply sunk, indeed, in selfishness who carries it with him on his knees, and who, even in God's presence, can think of nothing but himself and his own concerns; and I feel it the greatest privilege to be able to remember those I love, when making my requests of God, and to feel sure that He is as ready to answer my petitions for them as for myself.

M. Well, and if you do not think it a sin in one Chris-

tian to pray for another, do you think it a sin in one Christian to ask another's prayers?

F. No, certainly. If I did call it a sin, I should condemn St. Paul himself, who has more than once requested his disciples to offer up their prayers on his behalf.

M. Well, Frank, and do you suppose that it is only in this life we love each other, and show our love by praying for one another? and do you suppose that in the next life, when our charity shall be more perfect all our love for those we cared for here shall be forgotten, and that we shall not care to offer up one petition in their behalf? Do you think (added she, in a lower voice) that our dear mother, who used so often to pray for us, has now quite forgotten her children, and never once asks God's favour and mercy to them.

F. You ask me a question on a subject on which the Bible gives us very little information. It is remarkably silent as to the state and occupation of departed saints, in the interval between their death and resurrection. But if I am to answer what seems most probable to the speculations of my own reason, I must say that I do think it rational to believe that our love for those that we have loved on earth will survive the grave, and that even after death that love will find in prayer its natural expression. But whether we shall have any knowledge of what takes place on earth after our deaths is a point on which I have no information.

M. Your acknowledgment is made very grudgingly, but still you have said all I wanted. You said that you thought it right that Christians on earth should pray for each other; and you thought it right also in them to ask the prayers of others whom they thought more likely to be heard than themselves. Well, now, you own that it is not incredible that the saints in glory may intercede for us; and why should it be a sin (nay, idolatry you called it) to ask for those prayers which must be so much more likely to be heard than those of any sinner upon earth?

F. I guessed what you were coming to, dear Mary. But excuse me. I never said that we ought to ask the intercession of other Christians more likely to be heard than ourselves. Although I think it a great privilege to ask for the prayers of others, yet I am not sure but that it would be a sin, if I were to do so on these grounds: if I allowed myself to think that I had less right than they to come boldly to the Throne of Grace, or that my Saviour was less willing to hear me than them—if, in short, I allowed others to take His place, and act as mediators between me and God.

M. But for what other reason should we ask any one to pray for us? When I have asked others to pray for me, it was because I have been conscious how unworthy I was myself to ask anything of God; and because I desired to enlist in my behalf others more deserving of God's favour.

F. If I had these notions, it would be a great check on my prayers for others. If I might only pray for those who were less deserving of God's favour than myself, I do not know that I should venture to pray for you, dear Mary. And, indeed, there is something painful to my feelings in the very idea of drawing comparisons between the merits of two poor sinful creatures, and attempting to decide which is best entitled to God's favour. But, surely, when St. Paul asked for the prayers of his disciples, it was not that they were better entitled to God's favour than he, or more likely to be heard.

M. Indeed, it does seem strange that he should ask their prayers, unless, perhaps, it might be that in his humility he thought himself less likely to be heard than they.

F. If this were so, their prayers could not really benefit him, however he in his humility might think so; and it would have been very presumptuous if his converts had taken him at his word, and given him the prayers he asked for. But the truth is, our right to pray for others does not depend on our being more or less worthy than they. There are special promises in the Bible to united prayer. "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them."—Matt., xviii., 19. And I have no doubt that the united prayers of Paul's converts on his behalf were effectual in obtaining for that Apostle from God a still larger measure of His holy spirit. It is on these grounds that I rest the efficacy of mutual prayer, to say nothing of our having express commands to it.

"Confess your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed."—James, v., 14. And, surely, nothing can better enable us to realise the communion of saints, nothing can more thoroughly make us feel that we are all one body, than if, instead of each striving singly to secure his own salvation, we strive one for another, not only helping each other by counsel and active exertions, but also striving for one another in mutual supplications at the mercy-seat of the Most High. Mutual prayer of this kind does not keep any one at a distance from God, but, on the contrary, brings all nearer. But if I ask another to pray for me, because I think God more likely to hear him than me, I remain at a distance, and allow him to speak for me. I lose my faith in God's infinite willingness to answer the prayers of the humblest of his people. I show that I cannot bring myself to believe in and to accept the fullness of forgiveness that He has promised to our sins for Jesus'

sake, and that I look on myself as still shut out from Him, and trust to other mediators than the One to obtain access for me to Him. No, Mary, whenever my consciousness of my many sins makes me afraid to approach God, I think of that wonderful parable of the prodigal son. "When he was yet a great way off his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him." When I think of that affecting picture of our FATHER'S willingness to receive back his repentant wanderers, I cannot help feeling "I, too, am a son: through my Saviour Jesus I am privileged to come boldly into my Father's presence. I have many brothers who have not transgressed His commands as I have done; yet I no less than they are the objects of His boundless love, and may come near Him without fear of repulse." It would be dishonour to Him were I to doubt this; I should lose all the happiness of my life, if I lost my firm hold of this precious truth.

M. I must own, Frank, that yours is a very happy belief; still, your confidence in God's favour does not seem so strange, for you were always better than I, and I hope that there is nothing wrong in saying that, in spite of your change of religion, I can hardly help thinking you are so still, for you do not seem one bit changed. But, for my own part, I do not know how to conceive that my prayers can be as acceptable to God as those of many whom I know to be so much better Christians than myself.

F. It makes me smile to hear you speak of me as better than you. Well, I am not going to say what I think both of myself and of you, lest it should sound like an affectation of humility, or as if I were bandying compliments with you. But it shows me what blunders we should make if we went looking about for other men whose prayers we could trust to as more likely to be heard than our own. And one would be liable to make such mistakes exactly in proportion to his humility and his charity—just in proportion as he was inclined to think lowly of himself and well of others.

M. I suppose such mistakes would often occur. And this is exactly the reason why the Church has recommended us to have recourse to the intercession of departed saints. In every other respect it is exactly the same as asking for the prayers of a living friend, with only this difference, that there can be no mistake about their prayers finding more acceptance with God than our own. We might make mistakes if we were to choose for ourselves friends to intercede for us, but we cannot go wrong in asking for the help of any of those whom the Church has pointed out to us with authority as certain to be heard by God.

F. I think if I clearly expressed what I meant as to the reasons for asking the prayers of another which I consider wrong reasons, you would see that what you have just said shows that asking the intercession of saints must be mischievous in a way that asking the prayers of a living person never can be. When Christians pray for each other, they come before God like children of one common parent, pleasing Him by this exhibition of their love to each other, and by complying with his wishes that they should ask benefits for one another as well as for themselves, and yet none of them distrusting his Father's readiness to receive him lovingly, even if he came alone. Though we may believe other men to be far more holy than ourselves, still our confidence in them must always be mixed up with enough of doubt to prevent our trust in their prayers from superseding the feeling of a necessity for our own. But it would be impossible to have any distrustful feeling about the Blessed Virgin and the saints. If I thought that they could hear me, and that asking them would make them more likely to pray for me, I could not help asking their prayers, and feeling certain that their prayers would be more likely to prevail with God than mine; and when I thought so, I never could feel the same confidence in coming directly to God. If I had them to speak for me, I should not need to go myself.

M. And yet, why should praying to the Blessed Virgin prevent you from praying to God also?

F. It did not prevent me; yet my prayers to Him were rather offered as a duty than felt as a privilege: while I was sure I had her prayers, I did not feel the want of my own. It is only now that I know how much she stood between me and my Saviour, and how much of idolatry there was in the honour that I paid her.

M. Idolatry again! You may think me stupid, but I still find it hard to understand how you make out that it is right to ask for the prayers of a living friend, and wrong to ask for the intercession of a departed saint.

F. The difference is just this: when you ask for the prayers of living friends you say, "Come to God with me." When you ask the intercession of the Virgin or the saints, you say, "Go to God for me."

M. What did you mean by saying you would pray to the saints, if you thought asking them for their prayers was the best way to get them? Can there be any doubt of that?

F. I believe I was thinking of a saying of one of the old Fathers who, though he believed that the angels prayed for us, yet thought, as I do, that it would be an injury to Christ to ask their intercession; and he said that the best way to gain their prayers was to pray ourselves to Christ and to strive to do his will, for that then all holy spirits

would pray with us without being asked. And, certainly, I think that if these holy spirits could know of the honour paid to them here, and how often they supplant their Blessed Master in the minds of men, they must be deeply pained; and certainly would not be more disposed to intercede on behalf of those thus dishonouring their Lord.

*M.* If they could know! And do you doubt their being able to know what passes here?

*F.* To be sure I doubt a thing for which I have not a shadow of proof. What reason is there, for instance, to think that the Blessed Virgin can hear the innumerable prayers offered to her at the same time in thousands of places, all over the earth's surface. Is not this contrary to all reason? Is it not making her as omnipresent as God Himself?

*M.* I asked Father O'Driscoll once how this could be, and he said that this privilege had been given her by God at the time of her entrance into heaven.

*F.* And did this content you? or did you ask him how he found this out?

*M.* No; I suppose that is the doctrine of the Church.

*F.* Well, it is very singular, if she did get this privilege, that not a word should have been said about it in the Bible, and that no one in the Church should have suspected it for hundreds of years.

*M.* I cannot argue out of the Bible or the Fathers with one who has read so much more than I; but do you really think that the saints in heaven know nothing of what passes on earth? Why, how could they be happy if they were left in ignorance of the fate of those whom they loved on earth, whom they might have left in the midst of trials and dangers, and concerning whom they must long to know whether or not they have surmounted these?

*F.* I might as well ask you how they could be happy if they heard that their friends had not surmounted these dangers; or if, as we know must be often the case, they beheld those dear to them treading on the downward path that leads to destruction, and preparing for eternal separation from themselves and from God.

*M.* Oh, Frank, this argument in your mouth is hard to answer. I hardly dare to say that it would be for our mother's happiness to know what is passing on earth, when I think of the change that has taken place in you, except that I believe there is still a great happiness in store for her and for me, in your return to the faith.

*F.* My dearest child, I did not mean to make you cry; but I do feel that it was a merciful dispensation that she was spared the pain of seeing me take a step which at that time would have distressed her beyond measure; but which, I am assured, would appear to her in a very different light now, if she could know of it. But as to the question you have raised as to the happiness of the blessed: I know not that we have a right to suppose that anything can be wanting to the happiness of those who are in the presence of the Lord; and, surely, their resignation to His will must be so perfect, and their trust in Him so complete, that they will be content to leave all earthly matters in His hands.

*M.* I should like, however, to hear what you say to that other question, of which I have often thought, and especially lately: how can one be happy in Heaven if one dear to them were lost for eternity?

*F.* It is, indeed, a painful question; yet we know that earthly love will at length give way, if lavished on an object who has repeatedly proved himself unworthy of it. Kindness over and over again repaid with ingratitude, unfeeling selfishness, baseness of disposition, will weary out love at last. Well; no one can be lost who has not wearied out a love far surpassing in tenderness the purest earthly love. I suppose we may believe that long before the love of the Redeemer can abandon any one, or give him over to a reprobate mind, the love of those who on earth best loved that lost one will have been changed into indignation at the despite done unto a Saviour still dearer to them. Yes, it seems that the only way in which we can conceive of the happiness of the blessed is believing that their union with their Saviour's will and their concern for His glory are stronger feelings with them than any earthly love. And, if we weigh this, it makes us see, I think, how little we should gain by praying to the saints, instead of to Christ, and how little it is to be expected that they would be willing to receive us, supposing that His love was exhausted, and that He were unwilling Himself to receive our petitions.

*M.* It may be so; but I do not feel that I can talk any more controversy now.

*F.* I feel that too; but if you will promise me to read your Douay Testament I shall feel that this would be better than any controversy in bringing you to agree with me.

*M.* Surely, I remember many texts being quoted in defence of the intercession of the saints.

*F.* I hardly know what these texts are; but I don't think so much of the effect produced by one particular text or two, as of the whole tenor of the book. I really cannot remember a single passage directing us to ask the prayers of the Virgin and the saints; and when I think how impossible it would be to use such prayers without placing over confidence in them, I can see good reason why it should be so. The whole book sends us directly to Christ, as our only hope, our only confidence.

Ever since I have made that book my daily food, and have made myself familiar with the character of our Blessed Lord there described, I feel it impossible to think of any one else as more loving or more compassionate than He, or more ready to hear and answer my prayers.

*M.* You know I am not ignorant of the Testament. But, I confess, ever since your perversion (for I must call it so) I have been afraid to open the book. And I know what Father O'Driscoll would say if I were to tell him I was reading it.

*F.* Well, I can't think that any man has a right to forbid you God's Word; but, at all events, I don't see why he should know. For though you think it right to confess your sins to him, it surely cannot be a sin to read God's Holy Word, in the translation approved by your Church, and bearing your archbishop's name.

*M.* Don't ask me to promise you now, Frank; but I am thankful that I have seen you, for I have accustomed myself to think of Protestants scarcely as worshipping the same God as ourselves. But I see now it is only your head that has gone astray, and that there is as much religion and love of God in your heart as ever.

*F.* If I were to tell you all, you would find that I never believed so little as during that last year when I was nominally a Catholic. But there is not time for this now. Give my love to dear Ellen and Catherine. Tell them you have seen me, and try to make them think as charitably and affectionately of me as you do.

## Correspondence.

### "DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME."

—LUKE, XXII, 19.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—The text which I have placed at the head of my letter is one the right understanding of which must be owned to be very important. The Church of Rome teaches that by these few words our Lord ordained as priests his apostles who were then present, gave them power to transubstantiate bread and wine into his body, and directed them to offer up that body as a sacrifice for the living and the dead. May I trespass on your space with a brief inquiry whether the words are capable of bearing this meaning.

First, then, do the words "do this" mean, offer Me up as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead?

It is plain that the words "do this" mean "do what I have just done and am doing now;" and that if our Lord were not at that time offering Himself up as a propitiatory sacrifice, neither was He charging the apostles to do the same. Now, it must be remembered that the words in question were spoken on Thursday evening, the day before the crucifixion. If our Lord had on that evening already offered a sacrifice of infinite value as a propitiation for the sins of the living and the dead, then it would have been unnecessary that the sacrifice on the cross should have been offered on the next day. A few hours after these words "do this" were spoken, our Lord, in the agony at Gethsemane, wrestled in prayer with his Father. "If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me." Now we know that that cup of sorrow did not pass from Him; and since no prayer of Jesus could have been unheard, we may conclude with certainty that it was not possible that the salvation of the world could be otherwise accomplished. If we imagine such a case possible as that the Saviour, instead of praying, "Not my will, but Thine be done," had refused to drink the cup of suffering which his Father had placed in his hand, and had not become obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross, who can venture to deny that the work of propitiation for sin would have been left unaccomplished, and that, notwithstanding that He had instituted the supper on the evening before? If, then, it must be owned that on Thursday evening the infinitely precious sacrifice of Christ's body for the sins of the world had not been yet offered, He was not then offering that sacrifice, and by the words "do this" He could not have directed his apostles to do what He was not doing Himself.

Secondly, by these words "do this" did our Lord mean, "make my body?" If He did, it follows that our Lord on that occasion made the bread and wine into his own literal body, that with his own hands He took up his own body, brake it, and gave it to his disciples. Monstrous as this conclusion is, the Church of Rome has not shrunk from it. I copy the following words, which have already appeared in your paper, vol. iv., p. 125, quoted from Mr. Faber's work on the Sacrament, and describing our Lord's own communion on that Thursday evening: "The incarnate Lord received Himself incarnate, was held in his own hands, lay upon his own tongue, descended into his own heart, by the most real reality on earth, his own real presence in the Blessed Eucharist."—Faber, p. 477. Surely, if anything so startling as this had taken place the sacred writers would have explicitly mentioned something about it; yet Roman Catholics have no option but either to adopt the monstrous doctrine stated by Mr. Faber or else to admit that our Lord did not turn the bread and wine into his own natural flesh and blood, and, therefore, to be forced to own that the words "do this" gave no such power to his apostles.

Further he says, "Do this in remembrance of me."

Now, remembrance is not compatible with actual bodily presence. A friend going away may, on taking leave of you, ask you to remember him, but he would not ask you to remember him at the moment that he was promising to come to you. Who can believe that the words, "do this," mean bring me bodily into your presence in remembrance of me?

I think it is certain that any man who reads the narrative, without having any theory to support, but just satisfied to take the words in their plain meaning, can put no interpretation but one on our Lord's words "Do this in remembrance of me"—that is to say, Do what you have seen Me do. Take bread, break it, and bless it: then distribute it among yourselves and eat it: and so likewise with the wine, and this all is to be done in remembrance of Me.

I conclude, then, that the Eucharist is a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ. But as Jesus was Himself alive when He instituted the ordinance, and as He did not then offer up Himself as a sacrifice on the cross, or hold in his own hands his own crucified body; so we have no ground for believing that we are commanded to offer Him up afresh, or that we are to expect to feed carnally upon his natural flesh and blood. His body has been offered up once for all, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice. We may plead the remembrance of that sacrifice before God; may tell it out to the world: may believe that while we eat the symbols with our mouths we feed upon the Saviour in our spirits: but we have no warrant to believe, and we could find no greater comfort in believing, that Christ was to be really sacrificed every day, and his very flesh and blood to be eaten and drunk by our bodily mouths.

Yours, &c.,

R. H. B.

### ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Might I beg your insertion of a few remarks, intended as supplementary to those in my letter on the Sacrifice of the Mass, published in your last number. I trust it is not necessary to apologize for trespassing again on your valuable space on a subject so important, and deserving the strictest investigation. In the letter referred to, I proved, I hope, satisfactorily, that the sacrificial act in the Mass, being unbloody, could not be propitiatory, because, "without shedding of blood is no remission." Roman Catholic writers feel this difficulty; and to extricate themselves from it, have recourse to certain explanations and arguments, which also I examined at some length. They admit the Mass has no propitiatory virtue in itself, and that it derives all it has only from its connection with the Sacrifice on the Cross. They maintain, then, of course, that there is such a connection, and endeavour to prove it. They assert that the Mass is the application to the souls of the faithful of the fruits of the Sacrifice on the Cross. They assert, and also endeavour to prove, that the Sacrifice in the Mass and that on the Cross are one and the same. As to the former—that is the doctrine of *application*—I have nothing at present to add to what I said in my former letter. As to the latter position, that the two sacrifices are one and the same, I brought forward various arguments to show they could not be so—the one was bloody; the other is unbloody; in the one, there was suffering and death; in the other, there is neither. I showed that the offering priests in both were essentially different—that the times also were different; the one sacrificial act was performed and finished 1800 years ago; the others, as they are many, nay innumerable, may be performed to-day or to-morrow, or a year or years hence, as they have been years past; and what I wish to add at present is, that the same may be said with regard to *place* as well as *time*: the one sacrifice was offered up near *Jerusalem*; the others are in thousands of different *places*, and under thousands of different and opposite circumstances; and we ask how can they be the same, when there are so many essential points of dissimilarity and contrariety as all those I have enumerated, and more besides. There is, nevertheless, an answer given (a very convenient one, I may add, for getting rid of difficulties and troublesome arguments), and that is, that the doctrine is a *mystery*. Now, I would not wish to utter a syllable that would be calculated in the slightest degree to lessen the reverence every one should feel for *revealed* mysteries. God forbid. But to attempt to show by reasons and arguments that the sacrifices are the same; and when these are met by counter reasons and arguments, and proved insufficient, it seems scarcely fair then to reply that the subject is a mystery. To escape the force of certain opposing passages of Scripture, they have recourse to many explanations and ingenuities of defensive reasonings; but when hard pressed in turn by stronger reasonings, they take refuge in mystery. Waiving, however, any further consideration of this, let us test the soundness of the answer. In doing so, I maintain, in the first place, what I think is nearly self-evident, that the truth of a mystery, even above that of other propositions or doctrines, should be established by sufficient evidence. A great structure should not be erected on a narrow and shallow foundation. Thus, when the pretensions and claims in any case are great, they ought to be sustained by sufficient credentials; in like manner, where the mystery is great—so great as to stagger reason at every step—and when the practical consequences also built on this mystery are of such magnitude, it is not unreasonable to require it should be supported by corresponding proofs. Are these to be had